

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

WILLIAM C. DOAR, III,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:15-cv-03525-TLW
)	
WARDEN, ALLENDALE)	
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION)	AMENDED ORDER
)	
Respondent.)	
)	
_____)	

Petitioner William C. Doar, III, an inmate at the Allendale Correctional Institution in South Carolina, filed this *pro se* habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 on September 2, 2015. (ECF No. 1). Respondent filed a motion for summary judgment on February 1, 2016 (ECF No. 16), to which Petitioner filed a letter response in opposition on February 29, 2016 (ECF No. 19).

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 19.02(B)(2)(c), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant Respondent’s motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 21). Petitioner’s objections to the Report were due by March 31, 2016. Petitioner failed to file objections to the Report, and this matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a

district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and concludes that it accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (ECF No. 21). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Respondents’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 16) is **GRANTED**.¹

The Court has reviewed this petition in accordance with Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings. The Court concludes that it is not appropriate to issue a certificate of appealability as to the issues raised herein. Petitioner is advised that he may seek a certificate from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals under Rule 22 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

September 6, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina

¹ This Order effectively grants Respondents’ motion to amend, ECF No. 28.